

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (C) No. 830 of 2018**

1. Satya Prakash Rathore S/o Shri Gajadhar Prasad Rathore, Aged About 44 Years, R/o Shiv Nagar, Rungada, Ward No. 34, Post Balco Nagar, Tahsil Korba, District Korba, Chhattisgarh
2. Manish Kumar Yadav S/o Shri Tok Ram Yadav, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Kosir, Post Kosir, Tahsil Sarangarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
3. Smt. Ranu Yadav W/o Shri Neelkamal Yadav, Aged About 30 Years R/o Jai Hindi Gali, Kotara Road, Raigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. The State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Collector, Korba, District Korba, Chhattisgarh
3. The Sub Divisional Officer (Rev.) Podiuproda, District Korba, Chhattisgarh
4. Dwarika Prasad S/o Shri Ramprasad, Aged About 39 Years, Caste Ahir, R/o Village Amatikra, Uptahsil Podiuproda, Tahsil Katghora, District Korba, Chhattisgarh
5. Ranmat Bai Wd/o Late Ram Prasad, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Village Amatikra, Uptahsil Podiuproda, Tahsil Katghora, District Korba, Chhattisgarh
6. Fulbai Wd/o Late Ramprasad, Aged About 80 Years, R/o Amatikra, Tahsil Katghora, District Korba, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Pushpendra Kumar Patel, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Abhyunati Singh, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy
Order On Board

21.01.2020

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is the action on the part of the respondents 2 & 3 in releasing the compensation, which the petitioners were entitled for the land belonging to them which has been acquired, to the respondents 4 to 6.
2. The dispute, as per the petitioners, in the present writ petition is that the land over which the petitioners had the title was acquired by the State Govt., however, the compensation has been released to the respondents 4 to 6.
3. The fact is that the compensation has now already been released to the respondents 4 to 6 and the dispute being in respect of a portion of land which according to the petitioners they are the title holder and on the contrary, which as per the State Govt. has been paid to the actual owner i.e. respondents 4 to 6. That this being a disputed question of fact would require adjudication by leading evidence on either side which otherwise would not be permissible under the writ jurisdiction of this Court, the present writ petition as such would not be maintainable.
4. Reserving the right of the petitioners to avail other remedies open to them, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge